



DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL

209 E. Musser Street, Room 101
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4204
(775) 684-0150

MEMO PERD #28/00
September 25, 2000

PERSONNEL COMMISSION MEETING
Minutes of June 16, 2000

I. Call to Order

Chairman Manos called the meeting to order at 9:36 a.m., June 16, 2000, at the Grant Sawyer Building, 555 E. Washington, Room 4412, Las Vegas. Members present: Chairman Ted Manos, Commissioners Claudette Enus, James Skaggs, and Victoria Riley. Member not present: Teo Gamboa. Also present were: Jeanne Greene and Carol Thomas from the Department of Personnel, and Sr. Deputy Attorney General Jim Spencer was present via video conferencing in Carson City.

II. *Adoption of Agenda

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to adopt the agenda was seconded by Commissioner Enus and unanimously carried.

III. *Minutes of Previous Meeting

The minutes of the March 3, 2000, Personnel Commission meeting were approved by acclamation.

IV. *Regulation Changes

Section 18, NAC 284.526, Computation of payments for holidays, had been withdrawn from the agenda. Due to the amount of business before the Commission, Chairman Manos stated the proposed regulation changes would not be discussed in detail unless members of the Commission or other interested parties wanted to address particular sections. Chairman Manos read each section into the record and it was determined that Sections 5, 6, 21, and 26 would be discussed after approving the other sections as follows:

Section 1, amended NAC Chapter 284 by adding the provisions set forth in Sections 2 and 3.

Section 2, proposed by the Department of Personnel, added the "Family and Medical Leave Act" definition to NAC Chapter 284.

Section 3, proposed by the Department of Transportation, created a new regulation to describe the types of training and education an appointing authority shall consider when determining whether to approve or deny training and education requested by an employee.

Section 4, NAC 284.120, Adoption by reference of federal law, regulations and manual regarding persons with disabilities (NRS 284.155). This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, clarifies one of the telephone numbers listed is for individuals who use a technical device for the deaf (TDD).

Section 7, NAC 284.208, Compensation for dangerous duty or duty involving physical hardship. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, clarifies the document where the nature of work is described.

Section 8, NAC 284.370, Integration of subsequent list; material change in required qualification. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, clarifies that individuals may be integrated on ranked list for subsequent recruitment.

Section 9, NAC 284.378, Use of lists and consideration of eligible persons. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, allows for selective certification not subsequently reported to the Commission.

Section 10, NAC 284.484, Release time or leave to attend training. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Transportation, allows an agency to grant release time to an employee for various types of training and education in accordance with Section 3 of this regulation.

Section 11, NAC 284.486, Restrictions on use of money for training. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, clarifies current practice in which agencies use their discretion in approving types of training.

Section 12, NAC 284.490, Reimbursement or prepayment for training. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Information Technology, permits the agency to enter into an agreement with an employee for the repayment of money paid for the successful completion of a training or education course, related but not mandated by his job, if the employee terminates his employment with the agency within one year following the training.

Section 13, NAC 284.514, Educational leave stipends. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Transportation, allows an agency to grant an educational stipend for education in accordance with Section 3 of this regulation.

Section 14, NAC 284.522, Right to appeal. This amendment is necessitated by the addition of Section 3 of this regulation.

Section 15, NAC 284.523, Definitions. This amendment is necessitated by the addition of Section 2 of this regulation.

Section 16, NAC 284.5233, "Eligible employee" defined. This amendment is necessitated by the amendment of NAC 284.581.

Section 17, 284.52375, "Provider of health care" defined. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, updates the address information for The First Church of Christ, Scientist.

Section 19, NAC 284.539, Annual leave: Written request; approval or denial; authorized use. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, changes the reference to the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Section 20, NAC 284.558, Sick leave: Illness in employee's immediate family. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, provides for additional use of sick leave to care for an immediate family member without the previous authorization of the appointing authority, and provides for no limit to the use of family sick leave for a leave approved under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Section 22, NAC 284.566, Sick leave: Approval by appointing authority. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, changes the reference to the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Section 23, NAC 284.568, Sick leave: Placing employee on sick leave. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, removes a reference to NAC 284.5819 which is being repealed.

Section 24, NAC 284.5775, Temporary total disability: Use of sick leave, compensatory time, annual leave and catastrophic leave. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, clarifies the rights of an employee who has a temporary total disability.

Section 25, NAC 284.581, Family and medical leave: Adoption by reference of federal law and regulations regarding the Family and Medical Leave Act. The Department of Personnel, for the purposes of the administration of the Family and Medical Leave Act, adopts by reference the terms and conditions of the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Section 27, NAC 284.5813, Family and medical leave: Records; notice of obligations and effects. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, removes Section 2 as the terms and conditions of the Family and Medical Leave Act are being adopted by reference in NAC 284.581.

Section 28, NAC 284.6002, Physical assessments. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, removes a reference to NAC 284.5819 which is being repealed and directly references the Family and Medical Leave Act.

Section 29, NAC 289.6012, Temporary assignment: Effect of family and medical leave. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, removes a reference to NAC 284.5819 which is being repealed and directly references the Family and Medical Leave Act and the provisions of NAC 284.5811.

Section 30, NAC 284.658, "Grievance" defined. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, clarifies the role of the Employee-Management Committee.

Section 31, NAC 284.726, Access to confidential records. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, clarifies the storage requirements of health related records.

Section 32, NAC 284.802, Form of testimony. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, corrects a typographical error.

Section 33, NAC 284.882, Administration of screening tests. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, changes the reference in Section 2 of this regulation, necessitated by the repeal of NAC 484.631 by the Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety.

Section 34 repeals NAC regulations 284.0635, 284.081, 284.091, 284.0935, 284.5815, 284.5817 and 284.5819. The Department of Personnel is repealing these regulations as the terms have been adopted by reference in NAC 284.120 and NAC 284.581.

With regard to all the regulations set forth, except Sections 5, 6, 21 and 26, Chairman Manos called for a motion to approve the proposed amendments to Sections 1-4, 7-20, 22-25, and 27-34. Commissioner Skaggs' motion to approve, was seconded by Commissioner Riley and unanimously carried.

Sections 5, 6, 21, and 26 were discussed as follows:

Section 5, NAC 284.204, Adjustment of steps within same pay grade. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, allows an appointing authority or designated representative to approve adjustment of steps.

Section 6, NAC 284.206, Special adjustments to salaries. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, allows an appointing authority or his designated representative to approve special adjustments to salary.

Bob Gagnier, Executive Director, State of Nevada Employees Association, was opposed to the Department of Personnel delegating its authority for approving adjustments of steps and special salary adjustments to appointing authorities. Mr. Gagnier believed it

undermined the purposes of the merit system established by the Legislature in 1953 which was intended to provide uniformity.

Commissioner Enus expressed concern for how the provision would be used by senior management within a division and whether or not there would be any uniformity across division and department lines as to the basis for the increases. Chairman Manos added his concern with how the provision could be abused by management, leading to appeals regarding improper alignment among employees. He did not view the Department of Personnel as a "policing" agency; however, he thought they would ensure an independent voice, precluding any abuse.

Jeanne Greene, Director, Department of Personnel, stated the proposed amendment to Section 5 was to give agencies more flexibility. Typically, employees are hired at Step 1; however, if a higher step is needed for a new employee, approval must be obtained from the Department of Personnel. Currently, agencies can make employment offers; however, cannot make offers of accelerated salary until written approval from the Department of Personnel is received. The amendment to Section 5 would permit offers of salary by appointing authorities and they would be accountable for maintaining equitable relationships among their employees. With regard to Section 6, Ms. Greene stated the criteria an employee has to meet in order to be eligible for special salary adjustments was very specific and would not change by giving agencies the authority to grant them.

Carol Thomas, Chief, Technical Services, Department of Personnel, added that special salary adjustments are reviewed on a quarterly basis by the Budget Division and Legislature, and agencies are accountable for those actions.

Discussion continued regarding how long the current approval process takes, whether agencies would be required to submit reports to the Department of Personnel, and how the Department would ensure compliance of the regulations.

Ms. Greene explained the Department currently had delegation agreements with the University & Community College System, Department of Motor Vehicles & Public Safety, and Department of Transportation to approve special salary adjustments and accelerated salary steps, and there had not been any grievances filed as a result. Ms. Greene stated there was provision allowing the Department to enter into delegation agreements with agencies having the staff knowledge and willingness to assume some of the responsibilities.

Mr. Gagnier asked under what specific statute, the Department felt they could delegate their authority. Ms. Greene commented she could not speak to the specific provision which gave the Department that authority, but delegation contracts with the agencies had been reviewed and approved by legal counsel.

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Enus' motion to retain Sections 5 and 6 as unchanged was seconded by Commissioner Riley and approved, with Commissioner Skaggs opposed.

Section 21, NAC 284.562, Sick leave or catastrophic leave: Death in employee's immediate family. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, adds first cousin and first cousin in-law to the list of immediate family members.

Chairman Manos stated there were no boundaries to the regulation and requested an explanation from the Department of Personnel.

Referring to the source note on the regulation, Jim Spencer, Sr. Deputy Attorney General, stated the regulation has existed since 1973, was amended in 1984, and the last time it had been looked at was November, 1995. To his recollection, most of the relationships included had been in place since 1984.

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the amendment to Section 21, NAC 284.562, was seconded by Commissioner Enus. During discussion of the motion, Commissioner Skaggs stated the State's regulation regarding sick leave did not match the federal regulation. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Skaggs requested a review of NAC 284.562 by the Department and Chairman Manos agreed.

Section 26, NAC 284.5811, Family and medical leave: Maximum amount. This amendment, proposed by the Department of Personnel, changes the 12-month period from a calendar year basis to a "rolling" 12-month period measured backward.

Shelley Blotter, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, explained that an individual who used his allotted 12 weeks as a block, could not take leave again until one year from the beginning of the initial leave period.

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to approve Section 26 was seconded by Commissioner Enus and unanimously carried.

V. *Prohibitions and Penalties

Parole & Probation Division, Department of Motor Vehicles & Public Safety

Amy Wright, District Administrator, Division of Parole & Probation, and Henry Melendres, Personnel Analyst, Division of Parole & Probation, were present to answer any questions the Commission had regarding their revised policy.

Commissioner Skaggs inquired about the definition of "suspension" regarding whether or not the division considered a difference for exempt employees with the penalty of 30 calendar days because the suspension would have to cover a full week, unless it was a safety violation under the Wage and Hour Law.

Jeanne Greene replied it was addressed in NAC Chapter 284 and the division would have to comply with regulation.

In addressing the section defining who was considered an "immediate family member," Commissioner Skaggs proposed to include "in-laws" on the list.

Chairman Manos addressed the section defining "incompatible/conflicting activities." In Section B: Employment, he asked for clarification on "secondary employment." Ms. Wright replied it meant "moonlighting." Chairman Manos proposed to add the word "willfully," in Section B, 1, because it implied knowledge and intent, as follows: "Secondary employment in any business or activity which *willfully* takes advantage of the employee's position..."

Commissioner Skaggs asked where it was defined that State employment came first. Ms. Wright explained it was their intent to define what secondary employment may be appropriate and to give those guidelines. She believed the Division had a policy regarding requests for secondary employment, and there was an approval process.

Chairman Manos asked Jim Spencer for guidance regarding Section B, 3, Employment at any brothel. Mr. Spencer replied that brothels are a legal State business and couldn't answer for the division as to why they felt it needed to be addressed. Commissioner Skaggs added that Section B, 4, Employment at any business where the primary service was for sales or consumption of alcoholic beverages, was also a legal business.

Ms. Wright stated that Section B, 4, was in error and the division had removed it. Commissioner Riley asked if they were removing B, 4 why was B, 3 retained. Ms. Wright explained there were moral issues and an appearance of impropriety the division wanted to avoid. Commissioner Skaggs proposed removing section B, 3, and address it in their secondary employment approval process. Ms. Wright agreed to remove the section.

Commissioner Enus proposed adding a second sentence to Section B, 1, which stated employees would be responsible for completing the forms for approval associated with secondary employment.

Chairman Manos proposed that a definition of "association" be added for Section C: Association, to avoid the possibility of abuse. Ms. Wright agreed to add a definition.

In Section C, 2, Business relations, Chairman Manos stated using the term "relative" was not consistent with their definition of "immediate family members" and should be changed. Ms. Wright agreed.

Chairman Manos proposed rewording Section C, 3, to read, "Employees shall not accept gifts, gratuities, loans or services from offenders, known criminals, or on behalf of said offenders or known criminals." Ms. Wright agreed.

Chairman Manos addressed item 2 of Section D: Alcohol, Drugs, Conduct, and felt that prohibiting consumption of alcoholic beverages eight hours prior to start of shift was too much. Commissioner Skaggs stated that most law enforcement agencies have that policy.

Ms. Wright confirmed Commissioner Skaggs' statement. Commissioner Enus had also seen similar language in heavy equipment and construction operations. Chairman Manos withdrew his concerns.

Chairman Manos addressed Section G: Relations with Supervisors, Fellow Employees, or the Public, stating the division was leaving it up to the employees to determine what constitutes unethical behavior. Ms. Wright stated the division provided training in ethics to their employees on a regular basis, and unethical behaviors were addressed. Chairman Manos proposed adding a definition of those behaviors to the section. Commissioner Skaggs also proposed changing the term, "appropriate supervisor" to "appropriate authority" because the supervisor may be involved. Ms. Wright agreed.

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Skaggs' motion to adopt the Prohibition and Penalties of the Parole and Probation Division with the suggested changes the Commission had identified on record, was seconded by Commissioner Enus and unanimously carried. Commissioner Manos requested that a transcript of the discussion be provided to the division to assist in implementing the changes.

VI. *Classes Subject to Pre-Employment Screening for Controlled Substances
Capitol Police Division, Department of Motor Vehicles & Public Safety

Referring to Item IV in the agenda, Chairman Manos said NAC 284.4066 provides for the pre-employment testing for controlled substances of applicants for positions affecting public safety. At the request of the Capitol Police Division, the Department of Personnel has created a new class of Capitol Police Officer I. The division has requested the class be approved by the Commission for pre-employment drug testing. He called for a motion to approve the recommendation to include Capitol Police Officer I for pre-employment drug screening.

Commissioner Riley's motion to approve the recommendation was seconded by Commissioner Skaggs and unanimously carried.

VII. *Classification Appeals

A. Frances Berry, Program Assistant II
Office of the Secretary of State, Commercial Recordings

Frances Berry requested reallocation of her position to Program Assistant III, grade 27, based upon her responsibilities as an assistant unit supervisor. Ms. Berry explained she performs this duty during the absence of her supervisor, a Program Assistant IV, two hours per day.

Peter Long, Personnel Analyst, Department of Personnel, explained that Ms. Berry's assistant supervisor/leadwork responsibility was not new and represented only 5% of her overall duties. Mr. Long added that Ms. Berry's new duties included picking up,

delivering and processing mail; receipting and reconciling filings; and cross training with other sections within the agency; and those duties were currently performed throughout State service at or below grade 25. Unable to find significant change in Ms. Berry's duties, Mr. Long asked the Commission to deny the appeal.

Scott Anderson, Deputy Secretary of State, Uniform Commercial Coding, explained the assistant supervisors were currently at the same grade level as the positions they supervised. He felt since there had previously been a two-grade differential prior to the Program Assistant I's being upgraded to Program Assistant II's, the assistant supervisors should also be upgraded. Mr. Anderson added the assistant supervisors did not have full supervisory responsibility; however, provided significant assistance to the unit supervisor, and their duties would be broadened with additional statutory requirements. Mr. Anderson felt Ms. Berry's duties and responsibilities had been thoroughly documented and asked the Commission to grant the appeal.

There being no further discussion, Commissioner Skaggs' motion to deny the appeal was seconded by Commissioner Riley and unanimously carried.

- B. Les Smith and Chris Healy, Staff Conservation Educator; Geoff Schneider, Conservation Educator III; Elsie Sellas, John McKay, and PC #414, Conservation Educator II

Division of Wildlife, Department of Conservation & Natural Resources

Chairman Manos opened the appeal of the Conservation Educators in the Division of Wildlife, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, by summarizing the appeal. Les Smith is seeking to have Staff Conservation Educator, grade 36, reallocated to grade 38; and Chris Healy, Staff Conservation Educator, grade 36, an upgrade to a new class called Conservation Educator IV, grade 37. Jeff Schneider is requesting an upgrade to the proposed Conservation Educator IV, grade 37, and Elsie Sellers and John McKay, Conservation Educator II's, grade 33, are requesting reallocation to Conservation Educator III, grade 35. There's also a vacant position in Elko, which is currently a Conservation Educator II, grade 33, and the agency is proposing it also be upgraded to the new Conservation Educator IV, grade 37.

Chairman Manos asked all the appellants to stand and introduce themselves and also introduced the Assistant Director of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Freeman Johnson.

Mr. Johnson, opened the discussion by expressing his objective to regain the sense of symmetry and parity that existed prior to the occupational group study that was conducted in 1997.

The original recommendation proposed by the Department of Personnel aligned the Wildlife Biologists, Game Wardens, and Conservation Educators. As a result of an appeal of the law enforcement components of the Division of Wildlife, the Biologists and Game

Wardens were granted a two-grade upgrade. However, Conservation Educators were left behind in the process, and they did not appeal it. Thus, this appeal is seeking the parity that was originally proposed by the Department of Personnel.

Chairman Manos next recognized appellant McKay.

Mr. McKay disagreed with the points raised in the Director's response to the appeal, which relied heavily on the result of the last occupational group study, making direct comparisons between the Game Warden, Biologists and Conservation Educator series. Mr. McKay compared the scope of responsibility for Conservation Educators to that of the other series and explained in detail why he felt the journey-level, as well as the other levels in all three series, are comparable. He also compared the initial recommendation in the study to the final outcome approved by the Personnel Commission.

Finally, Mr. McKay addressed the fact that the Conservation Educators were asked by their department not to appeal during the last occupational study for fear of jeopardizing the appeals of the other series.

Mr. Johnson stated that reclassification is typically based on the existence of significant change as demonstrated in an NPD-19. However, he felt that correcting an oversight of the past could serve as a valid basis for a change. Mr. Johnson also indicated that a realignment of the Conservation Educator series would not create any equity problems in the agency.

Terry Crawforth, Administrator Division of Wildlife also indicated there would be no other impact in his division.

Chairman Manos then requested additional information regarding the appeal of the position in Elko, grade 33, which was proposed to go to 37.

Mr. Crawforth indicated that the Elko position was a new position in the agency and the division would be building a program in that region. Therefore, he recognized that the position was not as complex in comparison to the positions in the other regions. In response to further questions, he also acknowledged that there was no real need to upgrade that particular position at this time.

Mary Day, Supervisory Personnel Analyst with the Department of Personnel, addressed the Commission, indicating at the time of the occupational study, she conducted the evaluation of the Conservation Educator series as well as the Game Wardens and Biologists. Ms. Day commented that an individual appeal must still be based on significant change, which did not appear to have occurred in the Conservation Educator series. She further explained that the basis for the grade level distinctions recognized in the occupational group study were not the result of an administrative oversight. Rather, as a result of an analytical process, which considered the seven classification factors, it was

determined there was a two grade distinction between the Conservation Educator series and the Game Wardens and Biologists.

Ms. Day's comments were followed by a discussion of the occupational study process in that it is not unusual for recommendations to change based on information that is provided by management and employees during the appeal phase of the study. This occurred during the Conservation and Wildlife study, and the final recommendation approved by the Commission created a two-grade distinction between Conservation Educators and the Biologists and Game Wardens based on the requirement that the latter positions go through P.O.S.T. certification training. It was further clarified that this distinction was established as a result of an appeal at the director's level.

Mr. Johnson commented that the Biologists are not all required to be P.O.S.T. certified, and additional discussion followed regarding the reasons Biologists would need P.O.S.T. certification.

Mr. McKay stated that the P.O.S.T. certification recognized by the Department of Personnel during the occupational study was not new, and the two-grade distinction was not based on significant changes in these series.

Jeanne Greene, Director of the Department of Personnel, explained that in an individual study, significant change is a requirement; however, in an occupational study, the focus is not on significant change.

Mr. Crawforth explained the importance of conservation education in the State and his division's need for parity between the class series in order to recruit and retain the very best people.

Chairman Manos stated his belief that the Commission could overlook the provisions of NAC 284.126 and view this appeal as an extension of the occupational study. He also indicated his support of the appeal and called for a motion.

Jeanne Greene reminded the Chair that the Department of Personnel had not yet made a presentation to the Commission regarding the rationale for its decision.

Kathi Sinclair and Pat Ullom, Personnel Analysts in the Department of Personnel, continued the discussion by describing their analysis of the appellants' positions and comparing the current duties with those that were in place at the time of the occupational study. It was agreed in further discussions with the appellants, Mr. Johnson, and the analysts that no significant change had occurred. The basis of the NPD-19 was to get the issue before the Personnel Commission.

In concluding their presentation, the analysts indicated there could be an impact with regards to equity on the remaining positions in the Conservation Educator series.

Jeanne Greene also raised the issue of the impact on related classes and class series in the occupational group such as Forester II, the Nursery Specialist II, the Park Ranger, and the Park Interpreter. She questioned whether granting the appeals would leave the door open for those classes to come in and also ask for reallocation based upon this decision.

Mr. Johnson responded that his agency would not support further appeals from incumbents in related positions.

Chairman Manos again called for a motion.

Commissioner Enus provided comments recognizing the work of Conservation Educators and their value to the State. She also discussed the points made in the director's written response to the appellants related to her review of the appeal in terms of the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the Staff Biologists and the Staff Game Warden as compared to the Conservation Educators. Based on the study findings as well as the regulations and absence of significant change, Commissioner Enus moved that the appeal be denied.

With no second to Commissioner Enus' motion forthcoming, Commissioner Skaggs offered a motion to grant the appeals as presented.

Commissioner Riley seconded the motion, with Chairman Manos and Commissioner Skaggs voting in favor of the motion and Commissioner Enus opposed.

VIII. Uncontested Classification Action Report

No vote required.

IX. Selective Certification

No vote required.

X. Special Reports

The first item discussed under special reports related to a survey of other states conducted by the Department of Personnel pertaining to occupational study methods and procedures. Although no formal report had been prepared, Mary Day summarized some of the basic findings.

Next, Commissioner Skaggs raised questions regarding the Department of Personnel's quarterly program statistics. He noted there was a significant increase in the number of applicants certified to lists in the third quarter. Mary Ellen Komac, Chief, Field Services, Department of Personnel, explained that the EICON re-employment situation was still being dealt with and the numbers

reflected multiple certification factors. There was additional discussion regarding EICON re-employment issues.

The final item pertaining to previous questions raised by the Personnel Commission as to the viability of placing the Engineers on an occupational study fast track. Ms. Thomas explained that the Department had formed a committee consisting of Department of Personnel staff, agency staff, and University staff to review the occupational study process. The committee had agreed to establish criteria and schedule occupational studies based on need rather than a systematic schedule. The Commission was provided a list of criteria established by the committee, and after further discussion, members agreed it was a good approach to scheduling occupational studies.

In response to Commissioner Skaggs' inquiry regarding utilizing software to streamline the studies, Ms. Thomas indicated the department hoped to receive funding in the future that would allow technology to be incorporated into the occupational study process.

In response to Chairman Manos' concerns regarding the State's salary structure, Ms. Greene explained that as a strategy in addressing major recruitment problems, the Department has considered the possibility of establishing parallel series. These would be comparable to the supervisory levels without necessarily requiring supervisory responsibility. Commissioner Skaggs added most major corporations had a similar established policy.

XI. Comments by the General Public

None.

XII. Select Date for Next Meeting

Next meeting set for October 4-6, 2000, in Carson City.

XIII. *Adjournment

Commissioner Skaggs' motion to adjourn the meeting was seconded by Commissioner Enus and unanimously carried at 12:30 p.m.